arXiv:1404.0950v1 [math.CO] 3 Apr 2014

THE STRUCTURE OF ELUSIVE CODES IN HAMMING GRAPHS

NEIL I. GILLESPIE, DANIEL R. HAWTIN AND CHERYL E. PRAEGER

Abstract. We consider a *code* to be a subset of the vertices of a *Hamming graph* and the *set of neighbours* are those vertices not in the code, which are distance one from some codeword. An *elusive code* is a code for which the automorphism group of the set of neighbours is larger than that of the code itself. It is an open question as to whether, for an elusive code, the alphabet size always divides the length of the code. We provide a sufficient condition to ensure that this occurs. Finally, we present a sub-family of the Reed-Muller codes, proving that they are completely transitive and elusive, and that the condition fails for most codes in this sub-family. The length of these examples is again a multiple of the alphabet size.

1. Introduction

A *code* in a Hamming graph $H(m, q)$ is simply a subset C of its vertices and the automorphism group of C is the setwise stabiliser of C in the automorphism group of $H(m, q)$. A neighbour of C is a vertex not in C but distance one from some element of C. The concept of an elusive code arose from the question of whether, given a code C in a Hamming graph $H(m, q)$, the automorphism group X_1 of the set of neighbours C_1 could be larger than the automorphism group X of the code itself (see Section 2). This question was posed by the first and third authors in [1], where an affirmative answer was provided by constructing an infinite family of examples. We call such codes *elusive codes*.

If C is an elusive code then there exists an automorphism $x \in X_1 \setminus X$, which implies that $C^x \neq C$, and in particular there is a codeword $\alpha \in C$ with the property that $\alpha^x \notin C$. We make the following definition. (The *minimum distance* δ of a code is the shortest distance between two distinct codewords.)

Definition 1.1. Let C be an elusive code in $H(m, q)$ with minimum distance δ, and let $x \in X_1 \setminus X$ and $\alpha \in C$ such that $\alpha^x \notin C$. We call (C, α, x) an *elusive triple* with parameters (m, q, δ).

If (C, α, x) is an elusive triple then C^x and C are not equal, but are equivalent codes, each with the same neighbour set C_1. As such, given only information about the neighbour set, full knowledge of the code eludes us. In [1] it was shown that $\delta \leq 4$ for an elusive code. Moreover, if $\delta = 4$ then C is binary, that is to say $q = 2$. The examples of elusive codes given in [1] are indeed binary with $\delta = 4$. We are primarily interested in codes with $\delta \geq 3$, as this is the smallest minimum distance required for error correction. In [2] we gave a family of elusive codes with $\delta = 3$, containing infinitely many examples for each $q \geq 3$ (see Section 4). It is observed that for all known examples, the length m of the code is divisible by the alphabet size q. This led the authors to ask if q must always divide m [2, Question 1.3]. This is indeed true in the binary case, since $m(q - 1) = m$ must be even, by [1, Theorem 1], regardless of δ.

The aim of this paper is to present a sufficient condition on elusive codes to guarantee that q must divide m (see Theorem 1.2). We also give an infinite family of examples where this condition fails, but where again m is a multiple of q. Thus, while the question remains open, the results of this paper give more information about the structure of elusive codes.

Date: April 4, 2014.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 94B60, 05E18.

Key words and phrases: elusive codes, permutation codes, automorphism groups, Hamming graph, Reed-Muller codes, completely transitive.

Each author received support from a grant associated with Australian Research Council Federation Fellowship FF0776186.
The second author was supported by an Australian Postgraduate Award and UWA Top-up Scholarship.

We denote the set of vertices of $\Gamma = H(m,q)$ at distance r from some vertex α by $\Gamma_r(\alpha)$. Let (C,α,x) be an elusive triple, $\delta \geq 3$ and C_1, X, X_1 be as above. Since C^x is an equivalent code with $C_1^x = C_1$, each $\nu \in C_1$ is adjacent to some vertex π of C^x. That is, if $\nu \in \Gamma_1(\alpha)(\subseteq C_1$ since $\delta \geq 3)$, then there exists some vertex $\pi \in \Gamma_1(\nu) \cap C^x$. Now, x fixes C_1 and $\pi = \beta^x$ for some $\beta \in C$, so $\pi \notin \Gamma_1(\alpha)$. By definition, π is distance at most 2 from α and it follows that $\pi \in \Gamma_2(\alpha)$. We call such a vertex $\pi \in \Gamma_2(\alpha) \cap C^x$ a (C,α,x)-*associate*, or simply an *associate* if the elusive triple is clear from the context. The *set of* (C,α,x)-*associates* is $\Gamma_2(\alpha) \cap C^x$, and is the set of vertices in the code C^x which share at least one neighbour with α.

(Note that [1, 2] use the notation $\mathrm{Pre}(\alpha, x)$ to refer to the set of *pre-codewords*, which consist of all $\pi \in \Gamma_2(\alpha) \cap C^{x^{-1}}$. The notation introduced here aims to be a little more intuitive and succinct. In general, replacing x by x^{-1} allows most results to be carried over.)

Let π and π' be distinct (C,α,x)-associates. Then $\alpha \in C \cap \Gamma_2(\pi) \cap \Gamma_2(\pi')$ and we call α a *mutual codeword* of π and π'. We denote by $\mathrm{MC}(\pi,\pi')$ the number $|C \cap \Gamma_2(\pi) \cap \Gamma_2(\pi')|$ of mutual codewords of π and π'. We prove in Corollary 3.6 that $1 \leq \mathrm{MC}(\pi,\pi') \leq 3$. Moreover, since $\alpha \in \Gamma_2(\pi) \cap \Gamma_2(\pi')$ the vertices π, π' are at distance at most 4, and if they are at distance 4 we prove that $\mathrm{MC}(\pi,\pi') \leq 2$ (Lemma 3.3). If $\delta = 4$ then $d(\pi,\pi') = 4$, since π and π' are elements of the equivalent code C^x, which has the same minimum distance as C by [1, Lemma 4]. Hence $\mathrm{MC}(\pi,\pi')$ can be 3 only if $\delta = 3$. Every elusive triple (C,α,x) with $\delta = 3$ presented in Section 4, has the property that *for all distinct associates* $\pi, \pi' \in \Gamma_2(\alpha) \cap C^x$ *at distance* 3*, the parameter* $\mathrm{MC}(\pi,\pi') = 3$ (see Proposition 4.8). The main result of this paper shows that if this condition on mutual codewords holds for just *one* elusive triple, then the parameter m must be a multiple of q.

Theorem 1.2. *Let (C,α,x) be an elusive triple, with parameters $(m,q,3)$. Suppose that all (C,α,x)-associates π,π', such that $d(\pi,\pi') = 3$, satisfy $\mathrm{MC}(\pi,\pi') = 3$. Then $q \mid m$.*

We prove in Lemma 2.4 that if $q \geq 3$, there exist associates π, π' such that $d(\pi,\pi') = 3$, so that the hypotheses in Theorem 1.2 are not vacuously satisfied. If $q = 2$ then there are no associates π, π' at distance 3 from each other, however q still divides m by [1, Theorem 1].

We give an infinite family of examples in Section 6 such that no elusive triple satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 1.2 (see Theorem 1.3 below). However for each of the examples it holds that $q \mid m$. We also give a specific example for which $\mathrm{MC}(\pi,\pi') = 1$ for some associates π, π', thus achieving the lower bound of Corollary 3.6.

The codes in Section 6 are in fact the duals of the second order q-ary Reed-Muller codes, which include the binary extended Hamming codes. Let our alphabet $Q = \mathbb{F}_q$ be the finite field of order q and $M = \mathbb{F}_q^d$ be a d-dimensional vector space over the same field. If we let $s = (q-1)d - 1$, then we are interested in the codes,

$$C = \mathcal{RM}_q(s-1,d) := \{\alpha \in Q^M \mid \sum_{v \in M} \alpha_v = 0, \sum_{v \in M} \alpha_v v = \underline{0}\}.$$

A code is *G-completely transitive* if each C_i is a G-orbit, for some group G, for each $i \in \{0,\ldots,\rho\}$ (see, for instance, [3]). We prove the following result.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $C = \mathcal{RM}_q(s-1,d)$, where $s = (q-1)d-1$, and let $X = \mathrm{Aut}(C)$. Then the code C is X-completely transitive and elusive. Moreover, for any elusive triple (C,α,x), with $q \geq 5$, there exist associates π,π' such that $d(\pi,\pi') = 3$ and $\mathrm{MC}(\pi,\pi') \neq 3$.*

This family of examples also allows us to answer some of the questions asked in [2]. In that paper there are only two images of each example code C under X_1; [2, Question 1.4] asks if this is always the case. A *G-neighbour transitive* code is a code C, such that C and C_1 are both G-orbits for some group G. In [2, Question 1.4] it is asked whether the images of an elusive code C which is X-neighbour transitive must always be disjoint. In Remark 6.4 we demonstrate that the elusive codes in Section 6 provide examples of X-neighbour transitive elusive codes which have more than two images under X_1, and show that these images are not always disjoint.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **The Hamming Graphs.** Let the two sets M and Q have size m and q respectively. The vertex set of the Hamming graph $\Gamma = H(m,q)$ consists of all m-tuples with entries labelled by the set M, taken from the set Q. An edge exists between two vertices if they differ as m-tuples in exactly one position. For vertices $\alpha, \beta \in \Gamma$ the *Hamming distance* $d(\alpha,\beta)$ (that is the distance in Γ) is the number of entries in which α and β differ.

Recall that, for a vertex $\alpha \in \Gamma$, $\Gamma_r(\alpha) = \{\beta \in \Gamma \mid d(\alpha,\beta) = r\}$. We call $\Gamma_1(\alpha)$ the *set of neighbours* of α. The set of entries in which $\alpha, \beta \in \Gamma$ differ is $\mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\beta) = \{i \in M \mid \alpha_i \neq \beta_i\}$.

Given $\alpha \in \Gamma$, define $d(\alpha, C) = \min\{d(\alpha,\beta) \mid \beta \in C\}$. We then have the *covering radius* $\rho = \max\{d(\alpha, C) \mid \alpha \in \Gamma\}$. For any $r \leq \rho$, define $C_r = \{\alpha \in \Gamma \mid d(\alpha, C) = r\}$. Note that if $\delta \geq 2$, then the set of neighbours C_1 of the code C satisfies $C_1 = \cup_{\alpha \in C} \Gamma_1(\alpha)$ and if $\delta \geq 3$ this is a disjoint union.

The automorphism group $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$ of the Hamming graph is the semi-direct product $N \rtimes K$, where $N \cong S_q^m$ and $K \cong S_m$ (see [4, Theorem 9.2.1]). Let $g = (g_1, \ldots, g_m) \in N$, $\sigma \in K$ and $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m) \in \Gamma$. Then g and σ act on α as follows:

$$\alpha^g = (\alpha_1^{g_1}, \ldots, \alpha_m^{g_m}) \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha^\sigma = (\alpha_{1\sigma^{-1}}, \ldots, \alpha_{m\sigma^{-1}}).$$

The automorphism group of a code C in $\Gamma = H(m,q)$ is $\mathrm{Aut}(C) = \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)_C$, the setwise stabiliser of C in $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$. Note that we will refer to the automorphism group of any subset of vertices in this way, in particular the automorphism group of the set of neighbours of C is $\mathrm{Aut}(C_1) = \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)_{C_1}$. Throughout the present paper we set $X = \mathrm{Aut}(C)$ and $X_1 = \mathrm{Aut}(C_1)$.

Often coding theorists consider the group $\mathrm{PermAut}(C) = \{\sigma \mid h\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(C), h = 1 \in S_q^m, \sigma \in S_m\}$ of pure permutations on the entries of the code.

We say that two codes, C and C', in $H(m,q)$, are *equivalent* if there exists $x \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$ such that $C^x = C'$. Equivalence preserves minimum distance. (See [1, Lemma 4]).

We now introduce notation to refer to specific elements of $\Gamma_r(\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in H(m,q)$. Let $\alpha \in H(m,q)$, $a_i \in Q$ and $k_i \in M$, for $i = 1, \ldots, r$, where the k_i are pairwise distinct, and define

$$\gamma(\alpha|k_1, \ldots, k_r|a_1, \ldots, a_r)_i = \begin{cases} a_j & \text{if } k_j = i \\ \alpha_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

For example if $\alpha = (0, \ldots, 0)$, $r = 2$, $k_1 = 1$ and $k_2 = 2$, then $\gamma(\alpha|k_1, k_2|a, b) = (a, b, 0, \ldots, 0)$. Since $\gamma(\alpha|k_1, \ldots, k_r|a_1, \ldots, a_r)$ differs from α in at most r entries, we have $\gamma(\alpha|k_1, \ldots, k_r|a_1, \ldots, a_r) \in \cup_{i \leq r} \Gamma_i(\alpha)$, and if $a_i \neq \alpha_{k_i}$ for each i then $\gamma(\alpha|k_1, \ldots, k_r|a_1, \ldots, a_r) \in \Gamma_r(\alpha)$.

The next lemma is a restatement of the result [2, Lemma 3.11].

Lemma 2.1. *If two vertices $\alpha, \beta \in \Gamma$ are at distance 2 with $\mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\beta) = \{i, j\}$, then they are part of a unique 4-cycle with vertices $\alpha, \gamma(\alpha|i|\beta_i), \beta(= \gamma(\alpha|i, j|\beta_i, \beta_j))$ and $\gamma(\alpha|j|\beta_j)$.*

2.2. **Elusive Codes.** Let (C, α, x) be an elusive triple with $\delta \geq 2$. Then $\{\beta \in \Gamma \mid d(\beta, C_1) = 1\} = C \cup C_2$. In other words the 'set of neighbours' of C_1 is $C \cup C_2$. Thus, using [1, Lemma 3] with C_1 as the code, we have $X_1 \leq \mathrm{Aut}(C \cup C_2)$. Hence for all $\beta \in C$ and $y \in X_1$, $\beta^y \in C \cup C_2$.

A (C, α, x)-associate π, is any vertex $\pi \in C^x$ such that π is adjacent to some $\nu \in \Gamma_1(\alpha)$. If $\delta \geq 2$ the set (C, α, x)-associates is $\Gamma_2(\alpha) \cap C^x$.

The next Lemma is a combination [1, Lemma 6 (i) and (ii)] and [1, Lemma 7 (ii) and (iii)] respectively. (Note that $\Gamma_2(\alpha) \cap C^x = \mathrm{Pre}(\alpha, x^{-1})$). Each part of the partitions has size 2 by [1, Lemma 1].

Lemma 2.2. *Let (C, α, x) be an elusive triple with parameters (m, q, δ) where $\delta \geq 3$, and $\pi \in \Gamma_2(\alpha) \cap C^x$. Then*

(i) $\{\Gamma_1(\alpha) \cap \Gamma_1(\pi') \mid \pi' \in \Gamma_2(\alpha) \cap C^x\}$ forms a partition of $\Gamma_1(\alpha)$ with $m(q-1)/2$ parts of size 2.
(ii) $\{\Gamma_1(\pi) \cap \Gamma_1(\beta) \mid \beta \in \Gamma_2(\pi) \cap C\}$ forms a partition of $\Gamma_1(\pi)$ with $m(q-1)/2$ parts of size 2.

When asking questions about elusive codes, the following lemma allows us to consider an equivalent code, and the elusive triples which arise from it. In particular, we often assume the zero vertex is part of our code, which we are able to do since $\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$ is transitive on $H(m,q)$.

Lemma 2.3. *Let (C,α,x) be an elusive triple. Then $(C^y,\alpha^y,y^{-1}xy)$ is an elusive triple for any $y\in\mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$. Moreover, $(\Gamma_2(\alpha)\cap C^x)^y=\Gamma_2(\alpha^y)\cap C^{xy}$.*

Proof. First, y preserves distance in the Hamming graph, so $(C_1)^y=(C^y)_1$, and thus $(C^y)_1^{y^{-1}xy}=C_1^{xy}=C_1^y$. We have $\alpha^y\in C^y$. However $\alpha^{y(y^{-1}xy)}=\alpha^{xy}\notin C^y$, since $\alpha^x\notin C$, so $(C^y,\alpha^y,y^{-1}xy)$ is an elusive triple. Suppose $\pi\in\Gamma_2(\alpha)\cap C^x$, then $2=d(\pi,\alpha)=d(\pi^y,\alpha^y)$ and $\pi\in C^x$ so $\pi^y\in C^{xy}$. Similarly, suppose $\pi\in\Gamma_2(\alpha^y)\cap C^{xy}$, then $2=d(\pi,\alpha^y)=d(\pi^{y^{-1}},\alpha)$ and $\pi\in C^{xy}$ so $\pi^{y^{-1}}\in C^x$. Thus $(\Gamma_2(\alpha)\cap C^x)^y=\Gamma_2(\alpha^y)\cap C^{xy}$. □

Lemma 2.4. *Let (C,α,x) be an elusive triple with $q\geq 3$. Then there exist (C,α,x)-associates π_1,π_2 such that $d(\pi_1,\pi_2)=3$.*

Proof. By [1, Theorem 1] $\delta=3$ as $q\neq 2$. Lemma 2.3 allows us to assume $\alpha=\underline{0}$, the zero codeword. By Lemma 2.2 (i), $\{\Gamma_1(\alpha)\cap\Gamma_1(\pi')\mid\pi'\in\Gamma_2(\alpha)\cap C^x\}$ form a partition of $\Gamma_1(\alpha)$. Furthermore, again by Lemma 2.3, we can assume $\pi_1=\gamma(\underline{0}|1,2|1,1)$ is a (C,α,x)-associate, and thus the neighbours $\gamma(\underline{0}|1|1)$ and $\gamma(\underline{0}|2|1)$ appear in the same part of the partition, by Lemma 2.1. The neighbour $\gamma(\underline{0}|1|2)$ must also appear in a part, corresponding to an associate $\pi_2=\gamma(\underline{0}|1,i|2,a)$, for some $i\neq 1$, $a\neq 0$. Note that $i\neq 2$ since then $d(\pi_1,\pi_2)\leq 2$, however $\pi_1,\pi_2\in C^x$, which is equivalent to C and so has minimum distance 3. So $\mathrm{diff}(\pi_1,\pi_2)=\{1,2,i\}$ and thus $d(\pi_1,\pi_2)=3$. □

The reader will notice a difference in terminology from [2], where the concept of an *elusive pair* was used, a code-group pair (C,X'), where X' fixes C_1 setwise, but not C. This implies that there exists an element $x\in X'$ such that $x\in X_1\setminus X$, and hence also a codeword α such that $\alpha^x\notin C$, implying that (C,α,x) is an elusive triple. Conversely, if (C,α,x) is an elusive triple then for $X'=\langle x\rangle$, (C,X') is an elusive pair. Hence the two concepts are equivalent.

3. Mutual Codewords

We now investigate the way that the structure of the Hamming graph affects the configuration of codewords. First, given two vertices α and β in the Hamming graph, we find a way to express the vertices which are at distance 2 from both α and β. We then let α,β be mutual codewords of associates π,π', and use this condition to bound the size of $\mathrm{MC}(\pi,\pi')$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\alpha,\beta,\gamma\in\Gamma$ such that $\alpha,\beta\in\Gamma_2(\gamma)$. Then,*

(i) $d(\alpha,\beta)=4$ if and only if $\mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\gamma)\cap\mathrm{diff}(\beta,\gamma)=\emptyset$ and,
(ii) $d(\alpha,\beta)=3$ implies $|\mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\gamma)\cap\mathrm{diff}(\beta,\gamma)|=1$.

Proof. First, note that $\mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\beta)\subseteq\mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\gamma)\cup\mathrm{diff}(\beta,\gamma)$, since $\alpha_i=\beta_i=\gamma_i$ for any $i\notin\mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\gamma)\cup\mathrm{diff}(\beta,\gamma)$. By hypothesis, $|\mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\gamma)|=|\mathrm{diff}(\beta,\gamma)|=2$.

Suppose $d(\alpha,\beta)=4$, that is, $|\mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\beta)|=4$. It than follows from the above that $\mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\gamma)\cap\mathrm{diff}(\beta,\gamma)=\emptyset$. Conversely, if $\mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\gamma)\cap\mathrm{diff}(\beta,\gamma)=\emptyset$, then there are entries $i_1,i_2,j_1,j_2\in M$ such that $\alpha_{i_k}=\gamma_{i_k}\neq\beta_{i_k}$ and $\beta_{j_k}=\gamma_{j_k}\neq\alpha_{j_k}$, for $k=1,2$. Thus $\mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\beta)=\{i_1,i_2,j_1,j_2\}$ and $d(\alpha,\beta)=4$.

Assume $|\mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\beta)|=3$. Then $\mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\beta)\subseteq\mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\gamma)\cup\mathrm{diff}(\beta,\gamma)$ implies that either $|\mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\gamma)\cap\mathrm{diff}(\beta,\gamma)|=1$ or $\mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\gamma)$ and $\mathrm{diff}(\beta,\gamma)$ are disjoint and $\mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\beta)$ is a proper subset of the above. However, by (i), $\mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\gamma)$ and $\mathrm{diff}(\beta,\gamma)$ disjoint implies $d(\alpha,\beta)=4$. Thus $|\mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\gamma)\cap\mathrm{diff}(\beta,\gamma)|=1$. □

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose $\alpha,\beta\in\Gamma$ and $d(\alpha,\beta)=4$. Then $\Gamma_2(\alpha)\cap\Gamma_2(\beta)=\{\gamma(\alpha|i,j|\beta_i,\beta_j)\mid i,j\in\mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\beta),i\neq j\}$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality let $\alpha = \underline{0}$, the zero codeword, and $\beta = \gamma(\underline{0}|1,2,3,4|1,1,1,1)$ so that $\mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\beta) = \{1,2,3,4\}$. Any element of $\Gamma_2(\alpha)$ has the form $\gamma(\underline{0}|i,j|a,b)$ where $a,b \neq 0$ and $i \neq j$. Moreover, $\gamma(\underline{0}|i,j|a,b) \in \Gamma_2(\beta)$ if and only if $a = b = 1$ and $i,j \in \mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\beta)$. □

Lemma 3.3. *Let (C,α,x) be an elusive triple with $\delta \geq 3$ and let $\pi,\pi' \in \Gamma_2(\alpha) \cap C^x$ such that $d(\pi,\pi') = 4$. Then $1 \leq \mathrm{MC}(\pi,\pi') \leq 2$.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.3 we can assume $\alpha = \underline{0}$ and $\pi = \gamma(\underline{0}|1,2|1,1)$ and $\pi' = \gamma(\underline{0}|3,4|1,1)$, since by Lemma 3.1 $\mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\pi)$ and $\mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\pi')$ are disjoint. By Lemma 3.2, and running through each choice for i,j,

$$\Gamma_2(\pi) \cap \Gamma_2(\pi') = \{\underline{0}, \gamma(\underline{0}|1,2,3,4|1,1,1,1), \gamma(\underline{0}|i,j|1,1) \mid i \in \{1,2\}, j \in \{3,4\}\}.$$

Since $\underline{0} \in C$ we have $1 \leq \mathrm{MC}(\pi,\pi')$ and as $\delta \geq 3$ the only other possible element in $C \cap \Gamma_2(\pi) \cap \Gamma_2(\pi')$ is $\gamma(\underline{0}|1,2,3,4|1,1,1,1)$ and thus $\mathrm{MC}(\pi,\pi') \leq 2$. □

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose $q \geq 3$, $\alpha,\beta \in \Gamma$ and $d(\alpha,\beta) = 3$. Then $\Gamma_2(\alpha) \cap \Gamma_2(\beta) = \{\gamma(\alpha|i,j|a,\beta_j) \mid i,j \in \mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\beta), i \neq j, a \neq \alpha_i,\beta_i\}$, of size $6(q-2)$.*

Proof. Let $\gamma \in \Gamma_2(\alpha) \cap \Gamma_2(\beta)$. By Lemma 3.1, there is a unique (for γ) $i \in \mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\gamma) \cap \mathrm{diff}(\beta,\gamma)$, and we have $\gamma = \gamma(\alpha|i,j|a,\beta_j)$ where $j \in \mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\beta) \setminus \{i\}$ and $a \neq \alpha_i,\beta_i$. There are $\binom{3}{2} = 6$ choices for $\{i,j\}$, and there are $q-2$ choices for a. □

Lemma 3.5. *Let (C,α,x) be an elusive triple with $\delta = 3$ and $q \geq 3$. If $\pi,\pi' \in \Gamma_2(\alpha) \cap C^x$ with $d(\pi,\pi') = 3$, then $1 \leq \mathrm{MC}(\pi,\pi') \leq 3$. Moreover, if $\mathrm{MC}(\pi,\pi') = 3$ and $\{i,j\} = \mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\pi)$, $\{j,k\} = \mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\pi')$, then*

$$C \cap \Gamma_2(\pi) \cap \Gamma_2(\pi') = \{\alpha, \gamma(\alpha|i,j,k|\pi_i,\pi'_j,a), \gamma(\alpha|i,j,k|c,\pi_j,\pi'_k)\},$$

for some $a \neq \alpha_k,\pi'_k$, and some $c \neq \alpha_i,\pi_i$.

Proof. Note that $\mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\pi) \cap \mathrm{diff}(\alpha,\pi') = \{j\}$. In this proof, since we are primarily interested in what is happening in the entries i,j,k, we abbreviate $\gamma(\alpha|i,j,k|a,b,c)$ to simply abc. Let $S = \Gamma_2(\pi) \cap \Gamma_2(\pi') \cap C$. Then $\alpha \in S$, so $|S| \geq 1$. By Lemma 3.4

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_2(\pi) \cap \Gamma_2(\pi') &= \{\gamma(\pi|s,t|a,\pi'_t) \mid s,t \in \mathrm{diff}(\pi,\pi'), s \neq t, a \neq \pi_s,\pi'_s\}\\ &= \{\pi_i\pi'_j a,\ \ \pi_i b\pi'_k,\ \ \pi'_i\pi_j a,\ \ c\pi_j\pi'_k,\ \ \pi'_i b\pi_k,\ \ c\pi'_j\pi_k\\ &\qquad \mid a \neq \pi_k,\pi'_k; b \neq \pi_j,\pi'_j; c \neq \pi_i,\pi'_i\}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\delta = 3$, $\pi_k = \alpha_k$ and $\pi'_i = \alpha_i$, the set $S \setminus \{\alpha\}$ cannot contain vertices which agree with π and π' in the entries k and i respectively. This leaves us with $\pi_i\pi'_j a, \pi_i b\pi'_k$ and $c\pi_j\pi'_k$ as possible elements of $S \setminus \{\alpha\}$. In particular we can have at most one of each form, as $\delta \geq 3$. Suppose $\pi_i b\pi'_k \in S$ for some $b \neq \alpha_j,\pi_j,\pi'_j$. Then, since $\delta \geq 3$, $\pi_i\pi'_j a, c\pi_j\pi'_k \notin S$, as they agree with $\pi_i b\pi'_k$ in entry i and k respectively. In this case, $|S| = 2$.

On the other hand, if $\pi_i b\pi'_k \notin S$ then it immediately follows that $|S| \leq 3$, since we are left with at most one choice each of $\pi_i\pi'_j a$ and $b\pi_j\pi'_k$. If $\mathrm{MC}(\pi,\pi') = 3$ then S contains the vertices α, $\gamma(\alpha|i,j,k|\pi_i,\pi'_j,a)$ and $\gamma(\alpha|i,j,k|c,\pi_j,\pi'_k)$, for some $a \in Q \setminus \{\pi_k,\pi'_k\}$ and $c \in Q \setminus \{\pi_i,\pi'_i\}$. □

Corollary 3.6. *Let (C,α,x) be an elusive triple with $\delta \geq 3$ and π,π' be distinct (C,α,x)-associates. Then $1 \leq \mathrm{MC}(\pi,\pi') \leq 3$.*

Proof. Combining Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.5 gives the result. □

4. Permutation Codes

In this section we examine the infinite family of elusive codes presented in [2]. The main purpose of this is as motivation for the hypothesis in Theorem 1.2. In particular we find the full automorphism groups of the codes and their neighbour sets, and show that $\mathrm{MC}(\pi,\pi') = 3$ for any two associates π,π' at distance 3. These examples are instances of *permutation codes* and *frequency permutation arrays*, which have been studied, in particular, by Blake, Cohen and Deza in [5], and Huczynska and Mullen in [6], respectively.

Let $Q = \{1, \dots, q\}$ and S_q be the symmetric group on Q. We associate with each permutation $g \in S_q$ the vertex $\alpha(g) = (1^g, \dots, q^g)$ in $H(q, q)$. Now let $L = \{1, \dots, l\}$, $M = Q \times L$ and, for $T \subseteq S_q$, let $C(T, l)$ be the set of lq-tuples $(\alpha(g_1), \alpha(g_2), \dots, \alpha(g_l))$ in $H(lq, q)$ such that the product $g_1 \cdots g_l \in T$. Note that we write $C(T)$ when $l = 1$. Then, for instance, $C(A_q, l)$ consists of all lq-tuples obtained by concatenating l permutation codewords $\alpha(g_i)$, such that an even number of the g_i are odd permutations. Similarly, $C(S_q, l)$ is the code consisting of all lq-tuples obtained by concatenating l permutation codewords $\alpha(g_i)$, with no restriction on the g_i.

We define two actions of S_q on $H(q, q)$ which, combined with results from [7] and [8], allows us to describe the full automorphism groups of $C(A_q)$ and $C(S_q)$.

For $y \in S_q$, let $x_y = (y, \dots, y) \in N \cong Sym(Q)^q$ and let σ_y be the permutation in $K \cong Sym(M) (\cong Sym(Q)$ since $l = 1)$ induced by y. Then x_y and σ_y act on codewords in $C(S_q)$ via $\alpha(g)^{x_y} = \alpha(gy)$ and $\alpha(g)^{\sigma_y} = \alpha(y^{-1}g)$ for all $y \in S_q$, by [8].

There are two natural subgroups which arise from these actions,

$$\mathrm{Diag}_q(T) = \{x_y \mid y \in T\} \quad \text{and} \quad A(T) = \{x_y\sigma_y \mid y \in T\}.$$

Our aim is to show that for any $(C(A_q, l), \alpha, x)$-associates π, π' with $d(\pi, \pi') = 3$ we have $\mathrm{MC}(\pi, \pi') = 3$, and in order to do this we find X_1 in each case. In most cases $X_1 = \mathrm{Aut}(C(S_q, l))$, however there are two exceptions to this, which we treat in the next example.

Example 4.1. Let $C = C(A_3)$. Since each codeword is generated from a permutation, the neighbour set consists of every vertex containing a repeated entry, for example $113 \in C_1$. As above, another code with the same neighbour set is produced by the code $C(S_3 \setminus A_3) = \{132, 213, 321\}$ constructed from the odd permutations. In this case the repetition code $\mathrm{Rep}(3, 3) = \{111, 222, 333\}$ also has the same neighbour set and is equivalent under the automorphism $x = (1, (123), (132))$. There are no other codes with the same neighbour set and minimum distance. To see this note that $H(3, 3)$ is the disjoint union $C(A_3) \cup C(S_3 \setminus A_3) \cup \mathrm{Rep}(3, 3) \cup C_1$, and any two vertices $\alpha, \beta \notin C_1$ from different codes are at distance 2.

Let $C = C(A_2, 2) = \{1212, 2121\}$. Then C_1 is made up of vertices with an odd number of each symbol and $C(S_2 \setminus A_2, 2) = \{1221, 2112\}$ shares the same neighbour set. Additionally the code $\mathrm{Rep}(2, 4) = \{1111, 2222\}$ has neighbour set C_1 and is equivalent to C under the automorphism $x = (1, (12), 1, (12))$.

Lemma 4.2. *The full automorphism groups of $C(A_q)$ and $C(S_q)$ are the semi-direct products $\mathrm{Aut}(C(A_q)) = \mathrm{Diag}_q(A_q) \rtimes A(S_q)$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(C(S_q)) = \mathrm{Diag}_q(S_q) \rtimes A(S_q)$ respectively.*

Proof. Since A_q and S_q are 2-transitive, [7, Lemma 5.1.7] can be applied. Then [7, Lemma 5.1.5] gives $\mathrm{Aut}(C(A_q)) = \mathrm{Diag}_q(A_q) \rtimes A(N_{S_q}(A_q))$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(C(S_q)) = \mathrm{Diag}_q(S_q) \rtimes A(N_{S_q}(S_q))$, where $N_{S_q}(T)$ is the normaliser of T in S_q. The result follows since $N_{S_q}(A_q) = N_{S_q}(S_q) = S_q$. □

The next result is simply a re-wording of [2, Lemma 3.9].

Lemma 4.3. *$C(A_q, l)$ is an elusive code.*

The above result tells us that elusive triples (C, α, x) exist with $C = C(A_q, l)$. The remainder of this section provides results which allow us to decide if a triple (C, β, y), where $\beta \in C(A_q, l)$ and $y \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$, is an elusive triple.

Lemma 4.4. *The automorphism group of $C(S_q, l)$ contains the wreath product $(\mathrm{Diag}_q(S_q) \rtimes A(S_q)) \wr S_l$.*

Proof. This follows from [2, Corollary 3.6]. □

The next result allows us to show that $\mathrm{Aut}(C(S_q, l))$ acts imprimitively on M, which in turn allows us to find the full automorphism group. For $j \in L$ define (Q, j) to be the subset $\{(i, j) \mid i \in Q\}$ of $Q \times L$.

Lemma 4.5. *The partition $\{(Q, 1), \dots, (Q, l)\}$ is a system of imprimitivity for the action of $\mathrm{Aut}(C(S_q, l))$ on $M = Q \times L$. Moreover, $\mathrm{Aut}(C(S_q, l)) = (\mathrm{Diag}_q(S_q) \rtimes A(S_q)) \wr S_l$.*

Proof. Note that for any $\alpha \in C(S_q, l)$, we have $\alpha_a \neq \alpha_b$ whenever $a, b \in (Q, i)$ for some $i \in L$, since $(\alpha_{(1,i)}, \ldots, \alpha_{(q,i)}) = \alpha(g)$ for some permutation $g \in S_q$. We preemptively refer to $\{(Q,1), \ldots, (Q,l)\}$ as blocks. If a and b are in different blocks, we claim that they cannot be mapped to the same block. It follows from this claim that for any $x \in \mathrm{Aut}(C(S_q, l))$ and $i \in L$, either $(Q,i)^x \cap (Q,i) = \emptyset$ or $(Q,i)^x = (Q,i)$, since otherwise there exists $a \in (Q,i)^x \cap (Q,i)$ and $b \in (Q,i)$, with $b \in (Q,j)^x$ for some $j \neq i$. Thus, our claim implies $\{(Q,1), \ldots, (Q,l)\}$ is a system of imprimitivity for the action of $\mathrm{Aut}(C(S_q, l))$ on $M = Q \times L$.

We now prove our claim. Suppose $a = (i,j)$ and $b = (i',j')$, where $j \neq j'$. Then, by applying a permutation $\sigma \in (\mathrm{Diag}_q(S_q) \rtimes A(S_q)) \wr S_l$ such that $(i,j)^\sigma = (1,1)$ and $(i',j')^\sigma = (1,2)$, Lemma 4.4 allows us to assume that $a = (1,1)$ and $b = (1,2)$. For each $i \in Q$, let $\beta(i) = (\alpha(1), \alpha(g_i), \alpha(g), \ldots, \alpha(g))$, for some $g, g_i \in S_q$ with $1^{g_i} = i$. Then $\beta(i) \in C(S_q, l)$ for all $i \in Q$. Let $x = h\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(C(S_q, l))$ where $h \in S_q^{lq}$ and σ is an element of S_{lq}, the full symmetric group on M (note that we are not assuming here that σ preserves the Cartesian product $M = Q \times L$). Suppose $(1,1)^\sigma = (j,k)$ and $(1,2)^\sigma = (j',k)$ for some $j, j' \in Q$ and $k \in L$. If $1^{h_{(1,1)}} = r$, then $(\beta(i)_{(1,1)})^{h_{(1,1)}} = r$, for all $i \in Q$. However, there exists an s such that $(\beta(s)_{(1,2)})^{h_{(1,2)}} = r$. This means $(\beta(s)^x)_{(j,k)} = (\beta(s)^x)_{(j',k)} = r$, so $((\beta(s)^x)_{(1,k)}, \ldots, (\beta(s)^x)_{(q,k)}) \neq \alpha(g')$ for any $g' \in S_q$, a contradiction.

Since $\{(Q,1), \ldots, (Q,l)\}$ is a system of imprimitivity for the action of $\mathrm{Aut}(C(S_q, l))$ on $M = Q \times L$ we have $\mathrm{Aut}(C(S_q, l)) \leq H \wr S_l$, for some $H \leq S_q \wr S_q$. Any codeword $\alpha \in C(S_q, l)$ satisfies $\alpha_{(Q,1)} = \alpha(g)$, for some g. Also for any $g \in S_q$ we have $(\alpha(g), \ldots, \alpha(g)) \in C(S_q, l)$. Hence projecting the code $C(S_q, l)$ onto $(Q,1)$ gives $C(S_q)$. Thus, the group induced by $\mathrm{Aut}(C(S_q, l))$ on $(Q,1)$ is a subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(C(S_q))$, so we may assume that $H = \mathrm{Aut}(C(S_q))$. By Lemma 4.2, $H = \mathrm{Diag}_q(S_q) \rtimes A(S_q)$. Since $\mathrm{Aut}(C(S_q, l)) \geq (\mathrm{Diag}_q(S_q) \rtimes A(S_q)) \wr S_l$ by Lemma 4.4, it follows that $\mathrm{Aut}(C(S_q, l)) = H \wr S_l$. □

By the above result and the fact that $|C(S_q, l)| = 2|C(A_q, l)|$,

$$\mathrm{Aut}(C(A_q, l)) = \{(x_{y_1} z_1, \ldots, x_{y_l} z_l) \mid y_i \in S_q, z_i \in A(S_q), y_1 \cdots y_l \in A_q\},$$

since the above group has index 2 in $\mathrm{Aut}(C(S_q, l))$.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $\beta = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_l) \in H(lq, q)$, where $\beta_i \in C(S_q)_{k_i}$, for $i = 1 \ldots, l$. Then $\beta \in C(S_q, l)_k$, where $k = k_1 + \cdots + k_l$.*

Proof. Let $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_l) \in C(S_q, l)$, where $\alpha_i \in C(S_q)$, for $i = 1, \ldots, l$. Then $d(\alpha_i, \beta_i) \geq k_i$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, l$ so $d(\alpha, \beta) \geq k_1 + \cdots + k_l$. In particular, for each $i = i, \ldots, l$, there exists some $\gamma_i \in C(S_q)$ such that $d(\beta_i, \gamma_i) = k_i$, so $d(\beta, \gamma) = k_1 + \cdots + k_l$, where $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_l) \in H(lq, q)$. □

Set $X = \mathrm{Aut}(C(A_q, l))$ and $X_1 = \mathrm{Aut}(C(A_q, l)_1)$. We now show that, apart from two exceptions, the group $X_1 = \mathrm{Aut}(C(S_q, l))$.

Lemma 4.7. *Suppose $(q,l) \neq (3,1)$ or $(2,2)$. Then $C(S_q, l)$ is not an elusive code and $X_1 = \mathrm{Aut}(C(S_q, l))$.*

Proof. By [1, Lemma 3] $\mathrm{Aut}(C(S_q, l)) \leq \mathrm{Aut}(C(S_q, l)_1) = \mathrm{Aut}(C(A_q, l)_1)$, since $C(A_q, l)_1 = C(S_q, l)_1$ by [2, Lemma 3.8]. So $\mathrm{Aut}(C(S_q, l)) \leq X_1$. Moreover, it follows by definition that if we show that $C(S_q, l)$ is not elusive, then $\mathrm{Aut}(C(S_q, l)) = X_1$. We show that $C(S_q, l)$ is not elusive by showing no elusive triples exist. For the case $(q,l) = (2,1)$, $H(2,2) = C(S_2) \cup C(S_2)_1$, thus $C(S_2)_2$ is empty and there is no $\beta \in C(S_2)_2$ such that $\alpha^x = \beta$. Assume now that $(q,l) \neq (2,1)$.

Suppose that there exists an elusive triple $(C(S_q, l), \alpha, x)$. Then let $\beta = \alpha^x \in C(S_q, l)_2$. Now $\nu \in \Gamma_1(\alpha)$ implies $\nu^x \in C_1$, so that $\Gamma_1(\beta) \subseteq C(S_q, l)_1$. We now show that there exists $\gamma \in \Gamma_1(\beta) \cap C(S_q, l)_3$, which contradicts $\beta = \alpha^x \in C(S_q, l)_2$. Thus if x maps α to β then $x \notin X_1$ and so no such elusive triple exists.

If $\beta \in C(S_q, l)_2$, then either β differs from a codeword in two entries of a single block (Q, s), so that $\beta_{(Q,s)} = \nu \in C(S_q)_2$, and $\beta_{(Q,j)} = \alpha(g_j)$ for $j \neq s$, where $g_j \in S_q$; or β differs from a codeword in one entry of each of two distinct blocks (Q, s) and (Q, t), so that $\beta_{(Q,s)} = \mu$ and $\beta_{(Q,t)} = \nu$, where $\mu, \nu \in C(S_q)_1$, and $\beta_{(Q,j)} = \alpha(g_j)$ for $j \neq s, t$, where $g_j \in S_q$.

Let $l \geq 3$, with β taking either of the above forms, and choose $r \neq s, t$. Let $\beta'_{(Q,r)} = \nu'$, for some $\nu' \in \Gamma_1(\alpha(g_r))$, and $\beta'_{(Q,j)} = \beta_{(Q,j)}$ for $j \neq r$. Then β is adjacent to β' and β' lies in $C(S_q, l)_3$ by Lemma 4.6.

Let $l = 2$, $q \geq 3$. If $\beta = (\nu, \alpha(g))$ where $\nu \in C(S_q)_2$, then let $\beta' = (\nu, \mu)$ where $\mu \in \Gamma_1(\alpha(g))$. Similarly if $\beta = (\alpha(g), \nu)$. If $\beta = (\mu, \nu)$ where $\mu, \nu \in C(S_q)_1$, then let $\beta' = (\mu, \nu')$ where $\nu' \in \Gamma_1(\nu) \cap C(S_q)_2$ (note that $C(S_q)_2 \neq \emptyset$ since $q \geq 3$). In either case, β is adjacent to β' and, by Lemma 4.6, β' lies in $C(S_q, l)_3$.

Finally, let $l = 1$, $q \geq 4$. Any $\nu \in C(S_q)_2$ either has two entries repeated twice, or one entry repeated three times. Without loss of generality we may assume that ν is either $\gamma(\alpha(1)|2,3|1,1)$ or $\gamma(\alpha(1)|2,4|1,3)$, that is, $(1,1,1,4,\ldots,q)$ or $(1,1,3,3,5,\ldots,q)$. In either case, ν is adjacent to a vertex $\beta' \in C(S_q)_3$: in the first case we have $\beta' = \gamma(\alpha(1)|2,3,4|1,1,1)$ and in the second $\beta' = \gamma(\alpha(1)|2,4,5|1,3,1)$. Note that this uses $q \geq 5$ in the second case. For $q = 4$, $(1,1,3,3)$ is not adjacent to any $\beta' \in C(S_4)_3$, so in this case we prove there is no $x \in X_1$ which maps an element of $C(S_4)$ to $(1,1,3,3)$. Suppose $\alpha' = \alpha(g)$ for some $g \in S_4$ and $\alpha'^x = (1,1,3,3)$, for some $x = (h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4)\sigma \in X_1$, where $(h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4) \in S_4^4$, $\sigma \in S_4$. Let $i \in M$ such that $i^\sigma = 1$. Then there exists $a \in Q \setminus \{\alpha'_i\}$ such that $a^{h_i} = 3$. Therefore $\gamma(\alpha'|i|a) \in C(S_4)_1$ and $\gamma(\alpha'|i|a)^x = (3,1,3,3) \notin C(S_4)_1$. This implies $x \notin X_1$, giving us a contradiction. □

Lemma 4.7 leaves out the two cases $(q,l) = (3,1)$ and $(2,2)$. For these parameters, $C(S_q, l)$ is an elusive code with $\delta = 2$, since there are elements of X_1 which do not fix $C(S_q, l)$ (see Example 4.1).

The following proposition tells us that every elusive triple arising from $C(A_q, l)$ satisfies the conditions of Theorem 1.2.

Proposition 4.8. *Suppose $(C(A_q, l), \alpha, x)$ is an elusive triple. Then for any $(C(A_q, l), \alpha, x)$-associates π, π', such that $d(\pi, \pi') = 3$, we have* $\mathrm{MC}(\pi, \pi') = 3$.

Proof. If $(q,l) = (3,1)$ then $C = C(A_3)$ and we consider $\pi, \pi' \in \{111, 222, 333\}$ or $\pi, \pi' \in \{132, 321, 213\}$ (see Example 4.1). However it is easily checked that any choice of π and π' are each distance two from any $\alpha \in C$ and so $\mathrm{MC}(\pi, \pi') = 3$. By Lemma 4.7, either $(q,l) = (3,1)$ or $\pi, \pi' \in C(S_q \setminus A_q, l)$. We need only consider $q \geq 3$, since when $q = 2$ either $l = 1$ and there is only one codeword in $C(A_q, l)$ or $l \geq 2$ and $\delta = 4$. Thus, if $q = 2$ there is either only one associate or for all distinct $\pi, \pi' \in \Gamma_2(\alpha) \cap C^x$ we have $d(\pi, \pi') = 4$, and hence there do not exist $(C(A_q, l), \alpha, x)$-associates π, π', such that $d(\pi, \pi') = 3$.

Let $C = C(A_q, l)$ and $\alpha = (\alpha(g_1), \alpha(g_2), \ldots, \alpha(g_l)) \in C$. Then, by Lemma 4.7, each associate $\pi \in \Gamma_2(\alpha) \cap C^x$ has the form $\pi = (\alpha(h_1), \ldots, \alpha(h_l))$ where $h_s = g_s(ij)$ for some s and $i \neq j$, and $h_t = g_t$ if $t \neq s$. Consider another associate $\pi' = (\alpha(h'_1), \ldots, \alpha(h'_l))$ where $h'_{s'} = g_{s'}(i'j')$ for some s' and $i' \neq j'$, and $h'_t = g_t$ if $t \neq s'$. If $s \neq s'$ then $d(\pi, \pi') \geq 4$, so we must have $s = s'$. Moreover, $d(\pi, \pi') = 3$ if and only if $h'_s = g_s(jk)$, $k \neq i, j$ and $h'_t = h_t$ for $t \neq s$. Then $C \cap \Gamma_2(\pi) \cap \Gamma_2(\pi') = \{\alpha, (\alpha(b_1), \ldots, \alpha(b_l)) \mid b_s = g_s(ijk) \text{ or } g_s(ikj); b_t = g_t, t \neq s\}$, and $\mathrm{MC}(\pi, \pi') = 3$. □

5. Associate Graphs

In this section we use combinatorial graph theory to analyse the structure of an elusive code. In particular we use the property exhibited by $C(A_q, l)$, in Proposition 4.8, to give a condition which guarantees $q \mid m$ in an elusive code.

Definition 5.1. Let (C, α, x) be an elusive triple. The *associate graph* $\Pi(C, \alpha, x)$ is the graph with vertex set M and an edge between $i, j \in M$ whenever there is a (C, α, x)-associate $\pi = \gamma(\alpha|i, j|a, b) \in \Gamma_2(\alpha) \cap C^x$ for some $a \neq \alpha_i$ and $b \neq \alpha_j$.

Lemma 5.2. *Let (C, α, x) be an elusive triple with $\delta \geq 3$. Then the graph $\Pi(C, \alpha, x)$, as in Definition 5.1, is a simple, regular graph with valency $q - 1$.*

Proof. There are no loops in $\Pi(C, \alpha, x)$ since if $\pi = \gamma(\alpha|i, j|a, b) \in \Gamma_2(\alpha) \cap C^x$ we have $i \neq j$. Suppose $\pi = \gamma(\alpha|i, j|a, b)$ and $\pi' = \gamma(\alpha|i, j|a', b')$ are distinct associates. Then $d(\pi, \pi') \leq 2$, but π, π' are in the code C^x, which is equivalent to C, so this contradicts $\delta \geq 3$. Thus, there are no multiple edges in $\Pi(C, \alpha, x)$ and it is simple. By Lemma 2.2, the set of associates $\Gamma_2(\alpha) \cap C^x$ corresponds to a partition of $\Gamma_1(\alpha)$ with $m(q-1)/2$ parts of size 2, and each part corresponds to an edge of $\Pi(C, \alpha, x)$, namely the associate $\pi = \gamma(\alpha|i, j|a, b)$ corresponds to the part $\{\gamma(\alpha|i|a), \gamma(\alpha|j|b)\}$ and the edge $\{i, j\}$ of $\Pi(C, \alpha, x)$. Since we have a partition of

$\Gamma_1(\alpha)$, for any i the vertex $\gamma(\alpha|i|a)$ appears in a part for each $a \in Q \setminus \{\alpha_i\}$. Hence the vertex i of $\Pi(C, \alpha, x)$ is incident with exactly $q-1$ edges, so $\Pi(C, \alpha, x)$ is regular of valency $q-1$. □

Corollary 5.3. *Suppose (C, α, x) is an elusive triple with parameters (m, q, δ), where $\delta \geq 3$. Then $m \geq q$.*

Proof. The associate graph $\Pi(C, \alpha, x)$ has m vertices, each adjacent to $q-1$ other vertices by Lemma 5.2, so $m \geq q$. □

Lemma 5.4. *Let (C, α, x) be an elusive triple with $\delta \geq 3$ and π be a (C, α, x)-associate. Then there are $2q-4$ associates π' such that $d(\pi, \pi') = 3$.*

Proof. In the associate graph $\Pi(C, \alpha, x)$, π represents an edge between vertices i and j. Any other edge incident with vertex i or j represents an associate π' such that $d(\pi, \pi') = 3$. Since $\Pi(C, \alpha, x)$ is $(q-1)$-regular, by Lemma 5.2, there are $q-2$ other edges incident with each vertex i and j. Hence there are $2(q-2)$ such π'. □

Finally in this section we prove Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let (C, α, x) be an elusive triple with parameters $(m, q, 3)$ such that, for distinct $\pi, \pi' \in \Gamma_2(\alpha) \cap C^x$ with $d(\pi, \pi') = 3$ we have $\mathrm{MC}(\pi, \pi') = 3$. Without loss of generality, let $M = \{0, \ldots, m-1\}$, $Q = \{0, \ldots, q-1\}$ and $\alpha = \underline{0}$. Consider the graph $\Pi(C, \alpha, x)$, defined in Definition 5.1, and the vertex $i \in M$. Using the automorphism $\sigma = (0, i) \in K \cong S_m$ we can set $i = 0$ by Lemma 2.3, replacing C with C^σ.

By Lemma 5.2 there are edges between 0 and $q-1$ other vertices, say $j_1, \ldots, j_{q-1}$, with corresponding associates $\pi_i = \gamma(\underline{0}|0, j_i|a_i, b_i)$ for some $a_i, b_i \in Q \setminus \{0\}$. Again we apply Lemma 2.3, using an automorphism $y = \sigma h \in \mathrm{Aut}(\Gamma)$, where $\sigma \in K$ such that $j_i^\sigma = i$ and $h = (h_0, \ldots, h_{m-1}) \in N \cong S_q^m$ such that $a_i^{h_0} = i$ and $h_i = (b_i, 1)$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, q-1\}$ with $h_i = 1$ for $q \leq i \leq m$. Replacing C by C^y, we may assume that the vertex $0 \in M$ is adjacent to the vertices $i = 1, \ldots, q-1 \in M$, each edge having corresponding associate $\pi_i = \gamma(\underline{0}|0, i|i, 1)$. Recall that $\mathrm{diff}(\mu, \nu)$ denotes the set of entries in which vertices $\mu, \nu \in H(m, q)$ differ. Then, for each i, $\mathrm{diff}(\underline{0}, \pi_i) = \{0, i\}$, and for $i \neq j$, $\mathrm{diff}(\pi_i, \pi_j) = \{0, i, j\}$ so $d(\pi_i, \pi_j) = 3$.

Since $d(\pi_1, \pi_i) = 3$ for $i \in Q \setminus \{0, 1\}$, and by assumption $\mathrm{MC}(\pi_1, \pi_i) = 3$, we can apply Lemma 3.5. In particular $\mathrm{diff}(\underline{0}, \pi_1) \cap \mathrm{diff}(\underline{0}, \pi_i) = \{0\}$, so for each $i \in Q \setminus \{0, 1\}$ the third codeword listed in Lemma 3.5, applied to π_1, π_i, is $\beta_i = \gamma(\underline{0}|1, 0, i|a_i, 1, 1) \in C$, for some $a_i \in Q \setminus \{0, 1\}$ (note that we write this as $\gamma(\underline{0}|0, 1, i|1, a_i, 1)$ below). Moreover, the a_i are pairwise distinct, since $\delta = 3$. Note that this implies that every possible value for a_i occurs, since there are $q-2$ choices for both i and a_i.

Suppose the connected component of $\Pi(C, \alpha, x)$ containing the vertex 0 has more than q vertices. The vertex 0 is connected to the vertices $1, \ldots, q-1$, so there would need to be an edge from some vertex $i \in \{1, \ldots, q-1\}$ to a vertex $j \geq q$. Then we have a corresponding associate $\pi' = \gamma(\underline{0}|i, j|b_i, b_j)$. Let $\sigma = (1, i)(q, j) \in K$ and $h = (h_0, \ldots, h_{m-1})$ with $h_0 = (1, i)$, $h_i = (2, b_i)$, $h_j = (1, b_j)$ and $h_k = 1$ otherwise. Then $h\sigma$ swaps π_1 with π_i and fixes π_k for $k \neq 1, i$. Thus, replacing C by $C^{h\sigma}$, we can assume that $i = 1$ and $j = q$, the edge corresponds to the associate $\pi' = \gamma(\underline{0}|1, q|2, 1)$, and $\mathrm{diff}(\underline{0}, \pi') = \{1, q\}$.

Again, Lemma 3.5 allows us to determine the form of some codewords, in particular applying Lemma 3.5 to $\pi_1, \pi' \in \Gamma_2(\alpha) \cap C^x$ the second listed codeword is $\beta' = \gamma(\underline{0}|0, 1, q|1, 2, b) \in C$, for some $b \in Q \setminus \{0, 1\}$. However, from the previous paragraph there exists i such that $a_i = 2$ and for this i the codeword $\beta_i = \gamma(\underline{0}|0, 1, i|1, 2, 1) \in C$. This gives us a contradiction, since $d(\beta', \beta_i) = 2$. Thus there are q vertices in each connected component of $\Pi(C, \alpha, x)$ and, as the number of vertices in total is m, we see that q must divide m. □

Corollary 5.5. *If the hypotheses of Theorem 1.2 hold for the elusive triple (C, α, x) then the associate graph $\Pi(C, \alpha, x) = \frac{m}{q} \mathrm{K}_q$.*

6. Elusive Reed-Muller Codes

We now introduce a family of elusive codes which in general can attain any value of $\mathrm{MC}(\pi, \pi')$, that is those allowed by Lemmas 3.3 and 3.5, for some distinct associates π, π'. These codes are in fact Reed-Muller codes, although we use a slightly non-standard construction here.

Let $q \geq 2$ be a prime power and $d \geq 1$ be an integer, with $(d, q) \neq (1, 2)$. Moreover, let $Q = \mathbb{F}_q$, a finite field of order q, and $M = \mathbb{F}_q^d$, a vector space of dimension d over that field. We write $\alpha_v \in Q$ to refer to entry $v \in M$ of the vertex α in $H(q^d, q)$. Let $\mathcal{RM}_q(r, d)$ be the r-th order q-ary Reed-Muller code in $H(q^d, q)$, see [9, Section 5.4]. We do not need to know the structure of general codes in this family, only those for specific values of r which we now define. We fix $s = (q-1)d - 1$. Then,

$$\mathcal{RM}_q(s, d) := \{\alpha \in Q^M \mid \sum_{v \in M} \alpha_v = 0\}, \quad \text{and} \tag{6.1}$$

$$\mathcal{RM}_q(s-1, d) := \{\alpha \in \mathcal{RM}_q(s, d) \mid \sum_{v \in M} \alpha_v v = \underline{0}\}. \tag{6.2}$$

Note that the defining condition (6.1) is a vector equation, v being a vector and α_v being a scalar. Also, $\mathcal{RM}_q(s-r, d)$ and $\mathcal{RM}_q(r, d)$ are dual, in particular, $\mathcal{RM}_q(s, d)$ is the dual of the repetition code and $\mathcal{RM}_q(s-1, d)$ is the dual of $\mathcal{RM}_q(1, d)$. When $q = 2$, $\mathcal{RM}_q(s-1, d)$ is the extended Hamming code.

Lemma 6.1. *The code $\mathcal{RM}_q(s, d)$ is linear with dimension $q^d - 1$, minimum distance $\hat{\delta} = 2$, covering radius $\hat{\rho} = 1$ and $|\mathcal{RM}_q(s, d)_1| = (q-1)q^{q^d-1}$.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{RM}_q(s, d)$ is the dual of the repetition code it is well known that $\hat{\delta} = 2$ and $\hat{\rho} = 1$, see for instance [10]. Also $\mathcal{RM}_q(s, d)$ is linear of dimension $q^d - 1$ and so there are q^{q^d-1} codewords. Since $\hat{\rho} = 1$, the disjoint union $\mathcal{RM}_q(s, d) \cup \mathcal{RM}_q(s, d)_1$ is the entire vertex set of $H(q^d, q)$ and so $|\mathcal{RM}_q(s, d)_1| = q^{q^d} - q^{q^d-1}$. □

Lemma 6.2. *The code $\mathcal{RM}_q(s-1, d)$ has covering radius $\rho = 2$, and minimum distance $\delta = 4$ if $q = 2$ and $\delta = 3$ otherwise. Furthermore, the set of neighbours satisfies $\mathcal{RM}_q(s-1, d)_1 = \mathcal{RM}_q(s, d)_1$.*

Proof. The values for ρ and δ can be found in [9, Corollary 5.5.4]; [9, Theorem 5.4.1] tells us that $|\mathcal{RM}_q(s-1, d)| = q^{q^d-(d+1)}$. Since $\hat{\delta} = 2$ and $\mathcal{RM}_q(s-1, d) \subset \mathcal{RM}_q(s, d)$ it follows that $\mathcal{RM}_q(s-1, d)_1 \subset \mathcal{RM}_q(s, d)_1$. Also, since $\delta \geq 3$, $|\mathcal{RM}_q(s-1, d)_1| = m(q-1)|\mathcal{RM}_q(s-1, d)| = q^d(q-1)q^{q^d-(d+1)} = q^{q^d} - q^{q^d-1}$, and thus $\mathcal{RM}_q(s-1, d)_1 = \mathcal{RM}_q(s, d)_1$ by Lemma 6.1. □

Continuing the notation from previous sections, let,

$$X = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{RM}_q(s-1, d)) \quad \text{and} \quad X_1 = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{RM}_q(s-1, d)_1).$$

Note that $X_1 = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{RM}_q(s, d))$ because the previous lemma tells us $\mathcal{RM}_q(s-1, d)_1 = \mathcal{RM}_q(s, d)_1$, and $V\Gamma = \mathcal{RM}_q(s, d) \cup \mathcal{RM}_q(s, d)_1$ by Lemma 6.1.

Lemma 6.3. *The Reed-Muller code $\mathcal{RM}_q(s-1, d)$ is an elusive code.*

Proof. From above, $X = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{RM}_q(s-1, d))$ and $X_1 = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{RM}_q(s-1, d)_1) = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{RM}_q(s, d))$. Since $\mathcal{RM}_q(s, d)$ is linear, X_1 contains the translations t_α for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{RM}_q(s, d)$. If $\alpha \notin \mathcal{RM}_q(s-1, d)$ then t_α does not fix $\mathcal{RM}_q(s-1, d)$ setwise so $t_\alpha \notin X$. □

Recall that $\mathrm{PermAut}(C) = \{\sigma \mid h\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(C), h = 1 \in S_q^m, \sigma \in S_m\}$ is the group of pure permutations on entries fixing the code C. By [11, Theorem 5], $\mathrm{PermAut}(\mathcal{RM}_q(s-1, d)) \cong \mathrm{AGL}(d, q)$.

Remark 6.4. If p is the characteristic of the field $\mathbb{F}_q$, then any non-trivial translation has order p in X_1 so there are at least p distinct images of $\mathcal{RM}_q(s-1, d)$ under elements of X_1. Note also that $\sigma \in X_1$ for any $\sigma \in Sym(M)$, where σ acts by permuting entries. However, by [11, Theorem 5], $\sigma \in X$ if and only if $\sigma \in \mathrm{AGL}(d, q)$. Thus if $\sigma \in Sym(M) \setminus \mathrm{AGL}(d, q)$, then $\mathcal{RM}_q(s-1, d)^\sigma \neq \mathcal{RM}_q(s-1, d)$. However

$\underline{0} \in \mathcal{RM}_q(s-1,d)^\sigma \cap \mathcal{RM}_q(s-1,d)$, so for an elusive triple (C,α,x) the code C and it's image C^x need not be disjoint. These facts answer [2, Questions 1.4 and 1.5].

Recall that a code C is completely transitive if each set C_i is an X-orbit, for $0 \le i \le \rho$. By [3, Theorem 1.1] this definition generalises the one found in [12].

Lemma 6.5. *The Reed-Muller code $\mathcal{RM}_q(s-1,d)$ is X-completely transitive.*

Proof. As mentioned in Remark 6.4 X contains all $\sigma \in \mathrm{AGL}(d,q)$ acting as permutations on entries. Since $\mathrm{AGL}(d,q)$ is 2-transitive, $\mathcal{RM}_q(s-1,d)$ is completely transitive by [12, Proposition 7.2]. □

The next two results show us that most of the elusive triples in this section do not satisfy the conditions of Theorem 1.2.

Proposition 6.6. *Let $C = \mathcal{RM}_q(s-1,d)$, (C,α,x) be an elusive triple, and π be a (C,α,x)-associate. Then if,*

(i) $q \equiv 0 \pmod 3$ *there are at most two (C,α,x)-associates π' such that* $\mathrm{MC}(\pi,\pi') = 3$,
(ii) $q \equiv 1 \pmod 3$ *there are at most four (C,α,x)-associates π' such that* $\mathrm{MC}(\pi,\pi') = 3$,
(iii) $q \equiv 2 \pmod 3$ *there are no (C,α,x)-associates π' such that* $\mathrm{MC}(\pi,\pi') = 3$.

Proof. Since X is transitive on C, by Lemma 2.3, we can assume $\alpha = \underline{0}$. By (6.1) any associate has the form $\pi = \gamma(\underline{0}|u, v|a, -a)$. However, by Lemma 2.3 and the fact that $\mathrm{AGL}(d,q)$ is 2-transitive, using an appropriate automorphism $\sigma \in \mathrm{AGL}(d,q) \le \mathrm{PermAut}(C)$ and scalar multiplication by a^{-1}, we can, without loss of generality, let $\pi = \gamma(\underline{0}|0, e_1|1, -1)$.

By Lemma 5.4, there are a total of $(2q-4)$ $(C,\underline{0},x)$-associates at distance 3 from π. These are $\pi_{u,a} = \gamma(\underline{0}|u, v|a, -a)$, for some $v \in M$, by (6.1), where $u = 0$ and $a \in Q \setminus \{0,1\}$, or $u = e_1$ and $a \in Q \setminus \{0,-1\}$.

Suppose $\mathrm{MC}(\pi,\pi_{u,a}) = 3$, for some choice of u and a. By Lemma 3.5, $C \cap \Gamma_2(\pi) \cap \Gamma_2(\pi_{u,a})$ contains, depending on u and a, $\gamma(\underline{0}|0, e_1, v|a, -1, b_1)$ and $\gamma(\underline{0}|0, e_1, v|1, b_2, -a)$, if $u = 0$, or $\gamma(\underline{0}|0, e_1, v|b_3, -1, -a)$ and $\gamma(\underline{0}|0, e_1, v|1, a, b_4)$, if $u = e_1$, where $b_1 \in Q \setminus \{0, -a\}$, $b_2 \in Q \setminus \{0,-1\}$, $b_3 \in Q \setminus \{0,1\}$, and $b_4 \in Q \setminus \{0,-a\}$.

By (6.1), $b_1 = 1-a$ and $b_2 = a-1$, if $u = 0$, or $b_3 = a+1$ and $b_4 = -a-1$, if $u = e_1$. By (6.2), we then have $(1-a)v = e_1$ and $(a-1)e_1 = av$, if $u = 0$, or $e_1 = -av$ and $ae_1 = (a+1)v$, if $u = e_1$. Thus $(1-a)(a-1) = a$, if $u = 0$, or $-a^2 = a+1$, if $u = e_1$, that is, $a^2 - a + 1 = 0$, if $u = 0$, or $a^2 + a + 1 = 0$, if $u = e_1$.

Consider the case $u = 0$. Here a is a solution to the equation $x^2 - x + 1 = 0$. If $a = -1$ then $a^2 - a + 1 = 3 \equiv 0 \pmod q$, hence, $q \equiv 0 \pmod 3$. In this case $x^2 - x + 1 = x^2 + 2x + 1 = (x+1)^2$, and $x = a = -1$ is the only solution. Suppose $a \neq -1$, then a is a solution of $(1+x)(x^2 - x + 1) = x^3 + 1$ so $a = -c, -c^2$, where c is a primitive cube root of 1 in $\mathbb{F}_q$, and hence $3 \mid q-1$. We can deduce that $x^2 - x + 1$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{F}_q$ if $q \equiv 2 \pmod 3$.

Now let $u = e_1$. So a is a solution to the equation $x^2 + x + 1 = 0$. If $a = 1$ then $a^2 + a + 1 = 3 \equiv 0 \pmod q$, and thus $q \equiv 0 \pmod 3$. We then have $x^2 + x + 1 = x^2 - 2x + 1 = (x-1)^2$, and $x = a = 1$ is the only solution. Suppose $a \neq 1$, then a is a solution to $(x-1)(x^2 + x + 1) = x^3 - 1$ so $a = c, c^2$, where c is a primitive cube root of 1 in $\mathbb{F}_q$, and hence $3 \mid q-1$. We can deduce that $x^2 + x + 1$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{F}_q$ if $q \equiv 2 \pmod 3$.

If $q \equiv 2 \pmod 3$ there are no solutions to the required equations, so there are no associates at distance 3 from π with three mutual codewords.

If $q \equiv 0 \pmod 3$ we have at most two associates, one choice of a for each $u \in \{0, e_1\}$, namely $\pi_{0,-1} = \gamma(\underline{0}|0, -e_1| - 1, 1)$ and $\pi_{e_1,1} = \gamma(\underline{0}|e_1, -e_1|1, -1)$ at distance 3 from π, with the mutual codewords $\underline{0}$, $\gamma(\underline{0}|0, e_1, -e_1|1, 1, 1)$, and $\gamma(\underline{0}|0, e_1, -e_1| - 1, -1, -1)$.

If $q \equiv 1 \pmod 3$, then there are at most four associates, since given $u \in \{0, e_1\}$ there are two choices for a. These are $\pi_{0,-c} = \gamma(\underline{0}|0, (1+c)^{-1}e_1|-c, c)$, $\pi_{0,-c^2} = \gamma(\underline{0}|0, (1+c^2)^{-1}e_1|-c^2, c^2)$, $\pi_{e_1,c} = \gamma(\underline{0}|e_1, -c^{-1}e_1|c, -c)$, and $\pi_{e_1,c^2} = \gamma(\underline{0}|e_1, -c^{-2}e_1|c^2, -c^2)$. □

Corollary 6.7. *If $q \neq 3, 4$ and $C = \mathcal{RM}_q(s-1, d)$, then there is no elusive triple (C, α, x) satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 1.2.*

Proof. Let π be a (C, α, x)-associate. If $q = 2$, then there are no associates π' at distance 3 from π. Hence, by Lemma 3.3, $\mathrm{MC}(\pi, \pi') \neq 3$ for all associates π'. Suppose $q \geq 5$. By Lemma 5.4 there are 6 associates π' such that $d(\pi, \pi') = 3$. However by Proposition 6.6 at most four of these have $\mathrm{MC}(\pi, \pi') = 3$. Hence it is not possible that $\mathrm{MC}(\pi, \pi') = 3$ for all (C, α, x)-associates π, π' at distance 3. □

The three results Lemma 6.3, Lemma 6.5 and Corollary 6.7 combine to give a proof of Theorem 1.3. Finally, we give an example with $\mathrm{MC}(\pi, \pi') = 1$ for some associates π, π', showing that the lower bound in Corollary 3.6 can be attained.

Example 6.8. Consider $C = \mathcal{RM}_2(1, 3)$. Let $x = t_\beta\sigma$, where t_β is the translation induced by $\beta = \gamma(\underline{0}|e_1, e_1 + e_2 + e_3|1, 1)$, and $\sigma = (\underline{0}, e_1 + e_2 + e_3)$. Then $\pi, \pi' \in \Gamma_2(\underline{0}) \cap C^x$, where $\pi = \gamma(\underline{0}|0, e_1|1, 1)$ and $\pi' = \gamma(\underline{0}|e_2, e_3|1, 1)$, since $\underline{0}^x = \pi$ and $\gamma(\underline{0}|e_1, e_2, e_3, e_1 + e_2 + e_3|1, 1, 1, 1)^x = \pi'$. By Lemma 3.2, if $\alpha \in \Gamma_2(\pi) \cap \Gamma_2(\pi')$ then $\alpha = \underline{0}$ or $\gamma(\underline{0}|0, e_1, e_2, e_3|1, 1, 1, 1)$. However, by (6.2), $\gamma(\underline{0}|0, e_1, e_2, e_3|1, 1, 1, 1) \notin C$ since $e_1 + e_2 + e_3 \neq \underline{0}$. Thus $\mathrm{MC}(\pi, \pi') = 1$.

References

[1] N. I. Gillespie, C. E. Praeger, Neighbour transitivity on codes in hamming graphs, Designs, Codes and Cryptography 67 (3) (2013) 385–393. doi:10.1007/s10623-012-9614-5.

[2] D. R. Hawtin, N. I. Gillespie, C. E. Praeger, Elusive codes in Hamming graphs, Bulletin of the Australian Mathematical Society 88 (2013) 286–296. doi:10.1017/S0004972713000051.

[3] M. Giudici, C. E. Praeger, Completely transitive codes in Hamming graphs, European Journal of Combinatorics 20 (7) (1999) 647–662.

[4] A. E. Brouwer, A. M. Cohen, A. Neumaier, Distance-Regular Graphs, Vol. 18 of Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)], Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989.

[5] I. F. Blake, G. Cohen, M. Deza, Coding with permutations, Inf. Control 43 (1979) 1–19.

[6] S. Huczynska, G. L. Mullen, Frequency permutation arrays, Journal of Combinatorial Designs 14 (6) (2006) 463–478. doi:10.1002/jcd.20096.

[7] N. I. Gillespie, Neighbour transitivity on codes in Hamming graphs, Ph.D. thesis, The University of Western Australia, Perth, Australia (2011).

[8] N. Gillespie, C. Praeger, Diagonally neighbour transitive codes and frequency permutation arrays, Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics 39 (3) (2014) 733–747. doi:10.1007/s10801-013-0465-6.

[9] E. F. Assmus, J. D. Key, Designs and Their Codes, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, 1994.

[10] F. J. MacWilliams, N. J. A. Sloane, The Theory of Error Correcting Codes, North-Holland Mathematical Library, North-Holland, 1978.

[11] T. Berger, P. Charpin, The automorphism group of generalized Reed-Muller codes, Discrete mathematics 117 (1) (1993) 1–17.

[12] P. Solé, Completely regular codes and completely transitive codes, Discrete Mathematics 81 (2) (1990) 193–201.

[Gillespie] Heilbronn Institute for Mathematical Research, School of Mathematics, Howard House, University of Bristol, BS8 1SN, United Kingdom.

[Hawtin, Praeger] Centre for the Mathematics of Symmetry and Computation, University of Western Australia, 35 Stirling Highway, Crawley, WA 6009, Australia.

E-mail address: neil.gillespie@bristol.ac.uk, daniel.hawtin@research.uwa.edu.au, cheryl.praeger@uwa.edu.au